DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 476 602 SO 034 397

AUTHOR	Stokes, Helga
TITLE	Education for Conflict--Education for Peace.
PUB DATE	2002-03-00
NOTE	17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society (Orlando, FL, March 6-9, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Conflict; *Conflict Resolution; Higher Education; International Education; Models; Public Schools; *Role of Education
IDENTIFIERS	Historical Background; *Peace Education; *Peace Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper contrasts the use of education for conflict with the use of education for peace, shows some historical developments in the field of peace education, and summarizes facets and the diffusion of peace education. The paper explores some considerations for learning environments suitable for peace education programs and describes selected features of two schools to illustrate the implementation of some of the characteristics of peace education. It explains that, although college offerings in peace education worldwide demonstrate the scarcity of peace education programs in mainstream educational institutions, a Web site listing colleges and universities that offer peace studies programs shows approximately 120 graduate and undergraduate programs, most of which are located in North America. The paper notes that in public schools, peace education can at best be found in the international education or conflict resolution programs designed to prevent school violence. Appended is a reference list of peace education Web sites, selected by the U.S. Department of Education. (Contains 27 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Education for Conflict--Education for Peace.

Helga Stokes

ED 476 602

SO 034 397

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Stokes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EDUCATION FOR CONFLICT - EDUCATION FOR PEACE

by Helga Stokes
Hss117@psu.edu

Paper presented at the CIES 2002 Annual Meeting
Orlando, FL, March 6-9

Introduction

In this paper I contrast the use of education for conflict with the use of education for peace, show some historical developments in the field of peace education and summarize various facets and the diffusion of peace education. The paper explores some considerations for learning environments suitable for peace education programs and describes selected features of two schools in order to illustrate the implementation of some of the characteristics of peace education.

Education for Conflict

When a region or country experiences violent conflict brought about by racially, ethnically, or religiously motivated tensions, education enters as a factor in either instigating or alleviating those tensions and violence. A student participating in a peace education program implemented in Bosnia and Herzegovina since 1999 once commented: "Before the war, we were told that those others [in reference to other national ethnic groups] were not humans..." (EFP, 2001). The experience of this student illustrates how education was used to convince people belonging to one ethnic group that the people of another ethnic group are less than human and thus do not need to be safeguarded.

Education can create conflict in a variety of ways. Unequal distribution of educational opportunities, disregard for minorities, segregation of educational institutions, imposition of values which had not been socially negotiated and critically reviewed, all can potentially spark destructive conflicts.

The examples for education being used to stir up hatreds are manifold throughout history. The situation in the former Yugoslavia will serve as an illustration of the mechanism underlying this phenomenon. Ruzica Rosandic, in her article *Grappling with Peace Education in Serbia* (Rosandic, 2000), identifies several factors. A prevalent view that violence is natural and will always be with

us is infused into the school culture and the curriculum. "Although the texts [referring to history textbooks] address the horrors of war, they promote the bellicose behavior as a virtue" (Rosandic, 2000, p. 19). In the current Serbian school textbooks, society is divided into an "in-group" and an "out-group." Within the in-group, harmony is the ideal. Criticism is frowned upon and submission to the dominant group is a goal, whereas struggle against the out-group, defending the community identity, is a virtue. To compound the effect of this viewpoint, a transmission based approach to teaching prevents learners from acquiring skills that would allow them to reflect critically upon the values stressed in the texts.

Teachers who have been socialized in a school system that condones violence and have worked for a considerable time in such a system demonstrate difficulties in managing conflict and guiding the students to alternative ways of resolving their differences, as a study of 256 teachers in the Serbian school system found (Rosandic, 2000, p. 21).

Rosandic concludes that the schools are a reflection of the society at large and leadership patterns found in the society will be reflected in school governance, teaching styles, curricular content, and learning materials.

"Because educational initiatives can have polar opposite impacts, those involved must stop supporting peace-destroying educational initiatives, and start supporting those aimed at peace-building" (Bush and Saltarelli, 2000, p. VII).

To counteract potentially destructive influences of education and emphasize the need for education to serve as a catalyst for moving society towards a peaceful entity, calls for peace education have been voiced repeatedly, particularly after major conflagrations.

Catalysts for Peace Education

The perception of a need for peace education is frequently triggered by incidents of violence such as structural violence expressed in family violence, school violence, or crime; or violence within a nation against other ethnic groups or between nations in border disputes and invasions.

In a best case scenario, prevention is desired and the simple insight that peace should be the norm and not the exception can lead to the implementation of curricula designed for peace education.

One of the earliest mentions of peace education is attributed to seventeenth century Czech educator Comenius (Burns, Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 26); and another, in the United States, to a group of

educators, writers, and thinkers in New England concerned with violence in the American society (Johnson, 1998, p.1).

The spread of peace education efforts was often spurred on by peace movements or the formation of international agencies. During the twentieth century, after each of the two World Wars, first the League of Nations and later the United Nations gave focus to peace education endeavors.

The United States, though, heavily militarized during those same periods and permeated with paranoia during the McCarthy era, treated peace educators with suspicion. Peace educators could only get past this stalemate by shifting their focus from anti-militarism to society-building (Johnson, 1998, p.1).

The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, along with the arms race during the cold war, fueled efforts to conceive a disarmament education through which students learn about the mechanism and consequences of an unbridled arms build up (Burns, Aspeslagh, 1996, pp. 27-28).

The struggle against racial discrimination in the United States during the civil rights movement spawned efforts in non-violence education, conflict resolution, and multicultural education. The Martin Luther King Center for Nonviolent Social Change, in Atlanta, is to date a focal point of such activities, working on conflict resolution training (Harris, 1988, p. 65 and King Center, 2002).

Recognition of the interdependence of nations, exemplified in ecological concerns, fanned interest in world citizenship education, with UNESCO being a strong supporter and initiator (Burns, Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 29).

Most recently, since the end of the Cold War, the world community faces a bewildering array of conflicts brought about by lack of democratic governance, discrimination, social inequalities, uneven development, and gender inequity (University of Peace, Report, 2001, p. 12). In this regard Kofi Annan stated:

> "Yet, the world's record on education for peace has been weak indeed. Single cause explanations of armed conflict have invariably been too simplistic. Simple, all embracing solutions are doomed to failure. To address complex causes we need complex, interdisciplinary solutions. That is why, in the next generation, we have a mission to stimulate large numbers of students on every continent to reflect seriously on human conflict, its causes and consequences, and ways to prevent its deadly outcome." (Annan, 2001. p.7)

Facets of Peace Education

Peace education, as a discipline, is difficult to delineate. It encompasses the studying of the processes that lead to either conflict or peaceful coexistence and the development of values, attitudes, and skills for peace building, with the ultimate goal of ending violence and leading to societal change towards peace (Harris 1988, p. 17).

International education, global education, and multicultural education are linked to peace education and involve many different topics, such as education about diverse cultures, the study of relationships between nations, international law, foreign affairs, distribution of power and resources, colonialism, causes of wars between nations, disarmament education, and the economics of the arms race. These subject areas all flow into a curriculum designed to inform about and analyze the many factors that either give rise to, or prevent, conflicts and violence. Such a curriculum might draw on disciplines as diverse as biology and world languages. In one college, for example, the peace education program draws on supporting courses in nine different departments (Juniata College, 2002).

Learning about factors related to violence and peace would not guarantee internalization of peace-building values. Studying other cultures may lead to an appreciation and love for the diversity of existing cultures, but can also remain in the realm of information gathering and regurgitating. For peace education to accomplish societal change, attitude and value formation need to be considered and skills for consensus building and conflict resolution learned.

Multicultural education, non-violence education, human rights education, world-citizenship education, and violence-free conflict resolution feed into the values building aspect of peace education.

Multicultural education, in the sense of becoming aware of one's own and societal prejudices and one's stereotyping; and then learning strategies to admit and overcome those prejudices, is applicable here.

Non-violence education, also called Gandhian studies, which promotes the power of peace and nonviolence, is a factor in attitude formation. Found in religious thought, voiced and implemented by Gandhi and Martin Luther King, non-violence education intends to inculcate in students the insight that resorting to violence is not a choice, that they need to reject the notion of violence as being natural and inevitable. Creating a culture of positive peace is stressed (Harris, 1999, p.305/6).

Human rights education, with learners accepting universal human rights as common values for humanity and as a basis for action, is considered to support building a culture of peace. Human rights education has lately been stressed in a number of Latin American countries emerging or still suffering from serious human rights violations and civil unrest (Rodríguez, 2000).

Developing a larger loyalty than one's own nation, that is, a sense of world citizenship, with insights into the interdependence of the nation states, acceptance of diverse population groups as one humanity, as expressed in the principle of "unity in diversity," would be the outcome of international and multicultural education when integrated into one's value system. It would be a citizenship education that is multilayered, developing concern and activity at local, national, and global levels (Lynch, 1992, p. 2).

Acquiring the skills for consensus building, violence-free conflict resolution, and cross-cultural communication gives learners going through the process of peace education the tools necessary to express their values and attitudes in actions. Programs such as *Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways* (RIPP) for example, focus on social and cognitive skill building for non-violent conflict resolution and positive communication (Greenberg, Domitrovich, Bumbarger. 2001, p. 8). There are more than sixty such programs in the United States with varied approaches to skill building for various age levels and purposes (see Florida Department of Education 2002).

This brief survey of the many facets of peace education illustrates its complexity and the challenge of compacting and structuring it into curricula, learning modules, and training courses. Keeping this in mind, we will explore the diffusion of peace education.

Diffusion of Peace Education

College offerings in peace education worldwide demonstrate the scarcity of peace education programs in mainstream educational institutions. Galtung (1974), in his introductory article on peace education, complains that the universities did not welcome the peace research movement when it began in the 1950s and, even when some research began, the education component was hardly ever developed (Wulf, 1974, p. 153).

A web site listing colleges and universities worldwide which offer peace studies programs (Robin's Directory, 2002) shows approximately 120 graduate and undergraduate programs, the vast majority of which are located in North America, in particular in the United States:

Continent	Graduate and Professional	Undergraduate	not differentiated
Asia and the Pacific (Indonesia and Japan)	2		2
Australia	3	2	
Central and South America (Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala)			4
Europe (majority in Western Europe)	21	8	
Middle East (in Israel only)			2
North America (US, Canada, and Puerto Rico - majority in U.S.)	31	Major: 22 Minor only : 25	

This particular web site does not pretend to be all-inclusive, but being maintained under the auspices of the University of Colorado and last updated February, 2002, one can assume that the site makes an effort to reflect as accurately as possible the spread of peace studies programs. The unequal distribution of programs is noteworthy. According to the list, it is always only a handful of countries who have a concentration of programs on any of the continents. Africa is totally absent and for the Middle East, the only two listings are both located in Israel. Galtung's complaint, voiced in the 1970s, is still valid today and has worldwide application.

There is one international academic institution, a Treaty Organization endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly, which is the University for Peace, established in 1980 in San José, Costa Rica. Through the initiative of Kofi Annan, current Secretary-General of the United Nations, efforts were made to infuse the University with more funding and broaden its impact as a clearinghouse and inspiration for academic institutions internationally, especially those in developing countries (University of Peace, Report, 2001, p. 22).

In public schools peace education can at best be found tucked in under international education or in conflict resolution programs designed to prevent or diffuse school violence. A look at fifteen web sites of departments of education in the United States and seven internationally (see appendix) gave no direct mention of peace education as a learning goal, with the exception of Chile and India. Peace education seems to enter public schools through the efforts of outside agencies such as UNESCO at the international level, *Teaching Tolerance* (Teaching Tolerance, 2002) in the United States, or the *Association for Peace Education* (*Verein für Friedenspädagogik*) (Verein für Friedenspädagogik, 2002) in Germany. These and many similar secular or faith-based organizations provide teachers with materials and lobby for the inclusion of some form of peace education in

schools (Peace and Conflict Research Centers, 2.19.2002). The choice as to whether or not to use the materials is left to the discretion of individual teachers.

One noteworthy exception is the Ministry of Education of Chile which, as published on its web site, gives teachers goals and teaching strategies for peace education. Chile even has an official *School Day for Peace and Non-Violence* (*dia escolar por la Paz y la No Violencia)* (Ministerio de Educación de Chile, 2.14.2002).

Dina Rodríguez, in her paper on *The Role of Human Rights Education in Building a Culture of Peace in Latin America*, examines the state of human rights education in six countries, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Peru, Guatemala, and El Salvador. She mentions the Ministry of Education as being directly involved with human rights education in El Salvador and Guatemala. A variety of other state agencies, e.g., the Ministry of the Interior, are listed for the other countries. She does not comment on Chile here (Rodríguez, 2000, p. 24). She points to the role of diverse non-governmental organizations in developing material and promoting human rights education and stresses the need for increasing the role of the Ministries of Education. According to Rodríguez it is still basically the task and responsibility of the Ministries of Education and competent state institutions, together with the ample participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), grassroots organizations, church organizations, and other groups. They need to increase and deepen, at all levels of the system and in a continuous, coherent and integral way, their efforts at human rights education and education for democracy focused on creating a culture of peace, training teachers, and providing them with appropriate didactic materials (Rodríguez, 2000, p. 29).

From her remarks one can conclude that, even if peace education efforts are undertaken by grassroots organizations, state entities have to promote and institutionalize peace education in order for the domain to become a permanent fixture in the curricula and for the teachers to be adequately trained.

Implementation of Peace Education

Curricula for peace education exist and ways to implement them are manifold and diverse. Peace education could be infused into all subject areas commonly taught in schools or organized as a separate discipline in formal and non formal educational settings. As the overview of the facets of peace education demonstrated, there are many disciplines that feed into peace education.

Peace education could be accomplished through direct instruction, apprentice learning, or case-based, project, or problem-based learning. Many approaches are valid and can be used, depending on the circumstance and needs.

With the possible diversity of approaches in mind, one needs to consider some basic processes related to school environments and teaching strategies when creating peace education programs.

The environment in which peace education takes place needs to model the goals of peace education. Having worked myself for a number of years in traditional schools in the United States, I have witnessed at times an obsession with control which is creating the authoritarian leadership pattern Ruzica Rosandic criticizes. Symptoms of such a leadership style are manifested in school governance when intricate systems of referrals that lead to in-or-out-of-school suspension are set up, or a student government is only allowed to organize special events but has no voice in the actual planning and policy making of the everyday proceedings in school.

I also had the opportunity of gaining insight into schools, either innovative public, charter, or private, and in particular Montessori schools, that strive to establish a sense of community, cooperation and joint decision making. In these latter schools, I could consistently observe a more harmonious climate, higher student satisfaction, and fewer discipline problems. Maria Montessori speaks of the normalization of the child, when a child has a sense of focused work in the environment and is part of the decision making process that affects him or her. It is a manifestation of freedom attained through development where personality is constructed through the effort of the learner (Montessori, 1984, p. 205). It cannot be achieved through mere submission to authority. This "normalization" is reflected and manifested in more harmonious relationships with others and the environment on a personal level.

At the level of school governance, decision making in the school environment needs to involve the major stakeholder, who is the student. For example, in the spirit of democratic schools, an innovative public junior high/high school in State College, Pennsylvania, the Delta Program, has some distinct features:

> At Delta, there is an Advisory Council composed of 13 students, five parents, three teachers, and the Director, who is a non-voting member. This council meets monthly to advise on policy, assess program needs, and make recommendations on scheduling, budgets, curriculum, the school environment, and other related matters. There are also regular all-school meetings at which students, staff, and parents, if they wish, may raise any relevant issue of concern. All Delta community members in attendance have a voice on

> recommendations to Advisory Council. In addition, each Delta student is a member of a "clump," a group of up to 15 students who share a staff advisor. These clumps meet once each academic cycle (about every six days) to discuss any issues and concerns they may have, to plan shared activities, and to hear announcements. Recommendations to Advisory Council may be made. As at other levels, parents are welcome to attend. Delta students are also represented, along with staff and parents, on the selection committee for hiring of professional staff. All members of the Delta community may attend staff meetings (except, of course, those at which confidential matters concerning individual students are discussed, although that student and his or her parent(s) or guardian may be invited to attend that meeting). (Parent Recruiting Committee, 2000)

In regards to teaching strategies, there are certainly some instances in peace education in which direct instruction and a teacher-centered approach with experts lecturing could be used, but the nature of this subject matter demands that a transmission approach should be kept to a minimum. The acquisition of critical thinking skills is paramount so that people no longer fall into the trap of blindly accepting propaganda by a dominant group in society. An inquiry-based approach, with the student as worker and the teacher as the facilitator, is far more apt to help in the acquisition of critical thinking skills than an expert lecture approach.

The domain of peace education is in itself an ill-structured one, with no one right answer. As Kofi Annan said, "Simple, all embracing solutions are doomed to failure. To address complex causes we need complex, interdisciplinary solutions" (Annan, 2001, p.7). When learners explore issues of peace, they contemplate societal structures and human behavior for which there is not always a precedent or pat answer. They need to make connections between factors that had never been made before, create ways of looking at situations that incorporate many and diffuse angles. Learning would fail if there is oversimplification. From the point of few of cognitive flexibility theory, "compartmentalization of knowledge components is an effective strategy in well-structured domains, but [it] blocks effective learning in more intertwined, ill-structured domains that require high degrees of knowledge interconnectedness" (Spiro, et al., 1992, p. 62).

One concludes that textbook learning, information absorption, and repetition would not, in themselves, prepare students to effectively acquire knowledge, skills, and values in the realm of peace education and enable them to implement goals such as building a peaceful society. There are no pre-packaged prescriptions for acting peacefully. Students need to be able to draw on a wide variety of previous experiences and knowledge and assemble them in novel ways for particular problem-solving needs (see Spiro et al., 1992, p. 64).

Attempts have been made to integrate approaches to school governance, organization of the learning environment, and curricular content. Here is the example of one school that seems to be exemplifying this holistic approach.

The City Montessori School in Lucknow, India founded by Mr. Jagdish Gandhi and Mrs. Bharti Gandhi in 1959, is now a system of private schools offering education from Kindergarten through 12th grade to 23,000 students. The school was initially influenced by the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, as it still is, along with the values of the Bahá'í Faith, in a non-denominational environment (City Montessori School, 2001). The school adopted as its defining values global understanding and world citizenship, social responsibility and service to humanity, excellence in all things, peace issues, and religious values. Those values are infused into the curriculum. While aspiring to high academic standards, students frequently discuss issues related to those values and incorporate them in essays, artwork, and service activities. A mission statement was created that expresses the goal of overcoming any kind of religious or other prejudice.

It is an active learning environment. For example, students lobbied legislators for water pollution control, organized tree plantings, and hosted environmental seminars (City Montessori School, 2001). Thus students are involved in the creation of their learning trajectories.

The peace creating effect of the school were once experienced by the larger community, when a mosque in a neighboring town was destroyed by a group of Hindus in 1992 and the conflict between the Muslim and Hindu populations erupted in violent clashes in cities close to Lucknow. The peace education efforts of the school showed their efficacy by putting the school and its students into the forefront of conflict resolution measures when the students actually become instrumental in averting the eruption of violence in Lucknow. (European Platform for Conflict Prevention and Transformation, 2002)

Conclusion

I have discussed the use of education for either creating conflict or for leading to peaceful ways of living together. Some linkages were shown between historical events and the development of the field of peace education. The diffuse nature of the field of peace education was pointed out and its different facets summarized.

In order to obtain an idea about possible future trajectories for peace education, the current spread of peace education programs in tertiary education was analyzed and some developments in public elementary and secondary education characterized.

Lastly, some basic considerations for implementation were given and one exemplary school was described.

Considering that the United Nations has declared 2002 - 2010 the decade for a culture of peace and non-violence for the children of this world, it is opportune to consider how to initiate or renew learning processes that serve this goal. Searching the U.S. Department of Education's web site on peace education, only one statement on the Importance of International Education came up (U.S. Department of Ed. web site, 2.2002). The article talks about success in today's global environment. Is it only success that we want, to be better than the other? Or should we not, rather, consider goals that would serve humanity as a whole in creating a more peaceful environment for living?

Appendix

References to Peace Education on the web sited of selected Departments of Education – U.S.:

Links found at: http://ericeece.org/statlink.html_

U.S. Department of Education: http://www.ed.gov/
- Links to peace education related sites

Alabama: http://www.alsde.edu/
- 0 results

California: http://goldmine.cde.ca.gov
- 0 results

Connecticut: http://www.state.ct.us/sde/
- Violence Prevention Resource Guide for Connecticut Schools
- Resource Bank on Cultures

District of Columbia: http://www.k12.dc.us/dcps/home.html
- 0 results

Florida: http://www.firn.edu/doe/
- 0 results

Hawaii: http://kalama.doe.hawaii.edu/upena/
- 0 result

Illinois: http://www.isbe.state.il.us/
- Illinois Academic Standards: Social Sciences - Human Rights mentioned under suggested topics

Maine: http://www.state.me.us/education/
- 0 results

Massachusetts: http://www.doe.mass.edu/
- May is Violence Prevention Month, themes featuring peace education related topics

New York: http://www.nysed.gov
- 0 results

Noth Carolina: http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/
- Character Education Partnership: The Center for the Prevention of School Violence and Character Education

Oregon: http://www.ode.state.or.us/

- Violence prevention summer institute for educatiors offered

Pennsylvania: http://www.pde.psu.edu/
- Idea bank for teacher use on conflict resolution

Texas: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/_
- Senate bill 133 chapter 37. discipline; law and order

References to Peace Education on the web sited of
Ministries of Education – International:

Links found at: http://www.unesco.org/education/partners/mined/mined.htm and
http://www.ibe.unesco.org/Links/linkhome.htm#mined

Brazil: http://www.mec.gov.br
- Environmental Education

Chile: http://www.mineduc.cl/
http://www.mineduc.cl/convivencia/convivencia.htm_
- Suggestions for peace education (article: *cultivemos la paz en tiempos de guerra*)

Germany: http://www.bmbf.de/
- Die Abteilung 1 "Europäische und internationale Zusammenarbeit
- Environmental education/ sustainable development "
  ftp://www.bmbf.de/011212bfne_bericht_kabinettfassung.pdf_

India: http://www.education.nic.in/
http://shikshanic.nic.in/cd50years/z/55/A9/55A90101.htm
- link to: education for international understanding

Ireland: http://www.irlgov.ie/educ/_
Parents Council (Primary) Peace Project

Jordan: http://www.moe.gov.jo/E_Moe.htm
- 0 results

South Africa: http://education.pwv.gov.za/
- Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy

References

Baker Institute for Peace & Conflict Studies (2002). Course Offerings. Retrieved 2.13.2002 from http://departments.juniata.edu/pacs/program.html

Bush, K.D. and Saltarelli D., (2000). *The two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict - towards a peacebuilding education for children.* Florence, Italy: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre

Burns, R. J. and Aspeslaugh. R., eds., (1996). *Three Decades of Peace Education Around the World.* New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.

City Montessori School, Lucknow India, (2001). Web site of organization; retrieved 11/13/2001 from http://www/cmseducation.org

EFP Education for Peace - Bosnia & Herzegovina, 2001. Web site of organization. Retrieved 9/29/2001 from http://www.efp.landegg.edu

European Platform for Conflict Prevention and Transformation, 2001. *India's City Montessori School Educates World Citizens.* Retrieved 9/26/2001 from http://www.oneworld.org/euconflict/pbp/6/3_india.htm

Florida Department. of Education, (2001). Links to conflict resolution programs. Retrieved 3.1.2002 from: http://www.unf.edu/dept/fie/sdfs

Galtung, J. (1974). *On peace Education* In: C. Wulf, Christoph, (Ed.), *Handbook on Peace Education (pp. 153-171).* Frankfurt/Main, Oslo: International Peace Research Association.

Greenberg, M., Domitrovich, C., Bumbarger B. (2001). *The Prevention of Mental Disorders in School-Aged Children: Current State of the Field.* Prevention & Treatment, Vol. 4, Article 1, posted March 30, 2001, American Psychological Association

Harris, Ian M., (1988). *Peace Education.* North Carolina and London: McFarland & Jefferson Company, Inc.,

Johnson, Marcia L., (1998). *Trends in Peace Education.* ERIC Identifier ED17123

Juniata College, (2002). Web site of organization. Retrieved 2.13.2002 from http://www.juniata.edu/

King center (2002). Web site of organization. Retrieved 2.26.2002 from http://www/thekingcenter.com/non/6steps.html).

Lynch, J. (1992). *Education for Citizenship in a Multicultural Society.* London: Cassell

Ministerio de Educación, Chile (2002). *Cultivemos la Paz en Tiempos de Guerra.* Retrieved 1.14.2002 from http://www/mineduc.cl/convivencia/convivencia.htm

Montessori, M. (1984). *The Absorbent Mind.* New York: Dell Publishing

Parent Recruiting Committee, (2000). *The Delta Program and You.* State College Area School District

Peace and Conflict Research Centers, Institutes, Organizations, and Networks, (2002). Listing of organizations. Retrieved 2.19.2002 from http://csf.colorado.edu/peace/orgs1.html

Robin's Directory, (2002). Listing of colleges with peace education . programs. Retrieved 2.20.2002 from http://cfs.colorado.edu/peace/academic.html

Spiro, R.J., Feltovich, P.J., Jacobson, M.J., Coulson, R.L. (1000) Cognitive Flexibility, Constructivism, and Hypertext: Random Access Instruction for Advanced Knowledge Acquisition in Ill-Structured Domains. In T. Duffy and D. Jonassen (Eds.), *Constructivism and the Technology of Instruction: A Conversation.* (pp. 57-75). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rodriguez, D. (2000). *The Pole of Human Rights Education in Building a Culture of Peace in Latin America.* University of Peace, pdf file PD/HR/9.1. Retrived 2.20.2002 from http://www.upeace.org.

Rosandic, R. (2000). *Grappling with peace Education in Serbia.* Washington, DC: United Stated Institute of Peace

United States Department of Education (2002). *International Affairs, The Importance of International Educuation.* Retrieved 2/14/2002 from: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/PES/international_ed.html

University for Peace, (2001). *Education for Peace in the 21st Century, Report on the Advisory Meeting on the Academic Program of the University for Peace.* Retrieved 2.20.2002 from http://www.upeace.org.

Teaching Tolerance(2002). Web site of the organization Retrieved 2.16.2002 from www.teachingtolerance.org

Verein für Friedenspädagogik, (2002). Web site of organization,. Retrieved 2.20.2002 from www.friedenspaedagogik.de

Wulf, Christoph, ed., 1974. *Handbook on Peace Education.* Frankfurt/Main - Oslo: International Peace Research Association.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
(OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Education for Conflict - Education for Peace	
Author(s): Helga Stokes	
Corporate Source: Conference Presentation, CIES 2002	Publication Date: March 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
↑ ☑	↑ ☐	↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Helga Stokes	Printed Name/Position/Title: Helga Stokes, Doctoral Candidate	
Organization/Address: Pennsylvania State University Instructional Systems & Comparative and Int'l. Education home: 710 West Brandon Ave, #E, State College PA 16801	Telephone: 814-867-4316	Fax:
	E-mail Address: hss11T@psu.edu	Date: 10/24/02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	GINIE Project (http://www.ginie.org)
Address:	e-publication: http://www.ginie.org/ref/papers.asp
Price:	

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	
Address:	

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

~~Acquisitions~~
~~ERIC/CRESS at AEL~~
~~P. O. Box 1348~~
~~Charleston, WV 25325-1348~~
~~Toll Free: 800-624-9120~~
~~FAX: 304-347-0467~~
~~e-mail: ericrc@ael.org~~
~~WWW: http://www.ael.org/eric/~~

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

~~ERIC Processing and Reference Facility~~
~~1100 West Street, 2nd Floor~~
~~Laurel, MD 20707-3598~~
~~Toll Free: 800-799-3742~~
~~Fax: 301-953-0263~~
~~E-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov~~
~~WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com~~

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)